

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12-17, 20-26, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,559 to Balakrishnan ("Balakrishnan"). Claims 7, 8, 11, 18, 19, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious in view of Balakrishnan. Claims 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Balakrishnan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,444 to Weber ("Weber").

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the rejections are respectfully traversed and their withdrawal is requested. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly emphasize that the first and second grammars are loaded on a speech engine separate from the first and second applications. The speech engine may then use the tailored grammar for the recognized application.

Balakrishnan does not so teach. In Balakrishnan, speech is digitized and features are extracted. (Please see column 4, lines 18-21 of Balakrishnan). A decoder generates a CD phoneme network from the extracted features and outputs data

representing, for a given phoneme, the identities of the previous and subsequent phonemes, the identity of the present phoneme, the duration of the present phoneme and the score of the present phoneme (or scores for a small number of alternate phonemes). (Please see column 4, lines 21-27 of Balakrishnan).

The generated CD network is sent to or picked up by search applets of the applications. (Please see column 4, lines 27-29 of Balakrishnan). Using the data in the vocabularies and the language models, each of the applets provides a result of its recognition operation, including at least a score or confidence level for recognition. (Please see column 4, lines 29-33 of Balakrishnan).

These scores are delivered by the applications to an arbitrator in the operating system via API outputs, and the arbitrator determines which of the multiple applications is to act upon the input speech. (Please see column 4, lines 34-37 of Balakrishnan).

That is, in Balakrishnan, the vocabularies and language models associated with particular applications are used by the application rather than loaded into a speech engine separate from the application, as defined by claim 1.

Note that in the rejection of claim 6, the office action alleges that column 5, lines 16-18 and Figure 2, elements 44, 48, or 46 and 50 teaches loading the second grammar into the

speech recognizer engine. The cited portion of Balakrishnan does not so teach. In Figure 2, elements 44, 48, 46, and 50 are clearly stored in memory 42 and used by first application 32 and second application 34.

The current specification outlines an advantage that may be obtained by implementing this feature of claim 1: "By loading a grammar that is tailored to the application in focus, the speech service 24 allows the speech engine 22 to recognize phrases in the spoken input more accurately." (Please see page 13, lines 13-16 of the current specification).

The cited teachings of Balakrishnan do not provide this advantage. Instead, Balakrishnan teaches systems and techniques for determining which of multiple applications will process particular speech. In doing so, Balakrishnan teaches that the applications themselves include applets to search the application and determine a score that represents the probability that the particular speech is directed to the particular application.

Claim 1 is therefore patentable for at least the reason that Balakrishnan neither teaches nor suggests this feature of claim 1.

Claims 2-11 and 31

Claims 2-11 and 31 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 12

Claim 12 includes features similar to those of claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 13-21 and 32

Claims 13-21 and 32 depend from claim 12 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 22

Claim 22 includes features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 23-30 and 33

Claims 23-30 and 33 depend from claim 22 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 22.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. No fees are believed due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda G. Gunderson  
Reg. No. 46,341

Date: 04/26/04

Customer Number: 20985  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
PTO Customer Number: **20985**  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Telephone: (858) 678-5070  
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099  
10382973.doc